

REMARKS

The Office Action and the references cited therein have been carefully considered. Claims 12-16 and 22-35 are pending, claims 1-11 and 17-21 having been withdrawn by the Examiner. Claims 12-16, 22, 23, and 35 are rejected. Claims 24-34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are otherwise allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 24 and 29 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 35 has been amended to depend from claim 29 and is believed to be patentable for the same reasons as claim 29 and for the reasons set forth below. New claims 36-38 have been added and are believed to be patentable for the same reasons as claims 24 and 29.

The specification has been amended to describe original FIGs. 4 and 5 and new FIGs. 6a and 6b. A new paragraph has been added to describe the figures. These changes are supported by the originally filed claims, which are part of the specification, and the specification. No new matter has been added. The Examiner is requested to approve the changes to the specification.

The Examiner has objected to the abstract and has stated that it should set forth a process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious that is related to the claimed language. The abstract has been amended to put forth a use that is related to the claimed language. The removal of the objection to the abstract is respectfully requested.

The Examiner states the drawings fail to show all the steps and functions of claims 12-16 and 22-35. It is noted that 35 U.S.C. §113 requires drawings only when necessary for the understanding of the subject matter to be patented. 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) states that when detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention, the features should be illustrated in the form of a graphical drawing symbol or a labeled representation. While it is believed to be unnecessary for understanding the invention, new FIGs. 6a and 6b are submitted for approval. The Examiner is requested to approve the accompanying replacement drawing that contain new FIGs. 6a and 6b. These drawings show the steps and functions of original claims 22 to 35 and are supported by the claims and the original specification. No new matter has been added. FIG. 5 shows the steps of claims 12-16. The removal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 12-16, 22, 23, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Diamond et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,591,295). This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 12-16, 22, and 23 and the change in dependency of claim 35.

In re Appln. of Eric Davison et al.
Application No. 09/587,753

Claim 35 is believed to be patentable for the same reasons as claims 24-34. The Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejection of these claims and pass the application to issuance.

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin L. Wingate, Reg. No. 38662
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
6815 Weaver Road, Suite 300
Rockford, Illinois 61114-8018
(815) 963-7661 (telephone)
(815) 963-7664 (facsimile)

Date: June 2, 2004